

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Francis Raymond Edwards,  
 Plaintiff

v.

J. Dzurenda, et al.,  
 Defendants

Case No.: 2:20-cv-02318-JAD-EJY

**Order Dismissing and Closing Case**

Plaintiff Francis Raymond Edwards brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at Northern Nevada Correctional Center, Lovelock Correctional Center, and High Desert State Prison.<sup>1</sup> On June 30, 2021, I ordered Edwards to file his updated address and a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, as well as a first amended complaint, by September 1, 2021.<sup>2</sup> I expressly warned him that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case without prejudice.<sup>3</sup> The deadline has passed, and Edwards has not filed his updated address, a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or a first-amended complaint.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.<sup>4</sup> A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>5</sup> In determining whether to

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 1 (complaint).

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 5 (order).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

<sup>5</sup> See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to

dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>6</sup>

I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case. The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.<sup>7</sup> The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.<sup>8</sup> Edwards was warned that his case would be dismissed without prejudice if he failed to file his updated address, a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a first-amended complaint by September 1, 2021.<sup>9</sup> So, Edwards had adequate warning that his failure to file his updated address, a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a first-amended complaint by the deadline would result in this case's dismissal.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without prejudice based on Edwards's failure to file his updated address, a non-prisoner application to

---

comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

<sup>6</sup> *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.


<sup>7</sup> See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

<sup>8</sup> *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

<sup>9</sup> ECF No. 5 (order).

1 proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a first-amended complaint in compliance with this court's June  
2 30, 2021, order; and

3 The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS  
4 CASE.

5   
6 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
7 Dated: September 14, 2021  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28